APPENDIX A: ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE PREVIOUS DRAFT AMENDMENT

Alternatives Analyzed in Detail in the 2004 Amendment and Not Found to be Implementable.

Alternative B (Remove All Wild Horses): *BLM would remove all wild horses from the herd area as soon as possible.* Alternative methods for gathering horses, such as horse roping/hazing; net gunning, and tranquilizer darting would be required in order to gather all the horses. *In addition to the accelerated removal timeline, this alternative differs from Alternative A in that BLM would modify livestock forage allocation by pasture. The total forage allocation estimate within the Herd Area would be 6947 AUMs, to reflect current conditions.* This would be a 20% reduction from current total use. Specifically, allocation within the Twin Buttes Allotment would decrease from approximately 9,080 to 6,532 AUMs. However, allocation within the Bull Draw Allotment would increase from 187 to 415 AUMs. BLM would build no new fences. The permittee would retain maintenance responsibility for range improvements. All other resources would be managed in accordance with the existing situation. *There would be no new stipulations for oil and gas development.*

Alternative C (Small Herd in unfenced Preferred Habitat): *Wild horses would be managed within the Texas Mountain preferred habitat with an initial appropriate management level (AML) range between 29 and 60 head. The AML could be adjusted at a later date based on monitoring of range conditions.* This management range would be based on a four year gather schedule. Every fourth year, when the population had increased to approximately 60 horses, BLM would lower the herd to 29 horses using standard gather techniques. Periodic introduction of wild horses into the herd from other HMAs would be used to increase herd genetic variability (Appendix D). *The herd would primarily be managed within their preferred habitat surrounding Texas Mountain (see Map 2-1). A yearly average of 648 AUMs of the estimated 2179 available in the Texas Mountain area would be allocated to wild horses. Livestock would continue to use the area with reductions based on horse numbers. Available forage (6,299 AUMs) not allocated to wild horses would be allocated to livestock.* Livestock allocation within the Twin Buttes allotment would be reduced to 5,884 AUMs. Livestock allocation within the Bull Draw allotment would increase to 415 AUMs. BLM would build no new fences. The permittee would retain maintenance responsibility for range improvements. *Basic requirements that make the Texas Mountain area the preferred horse habitat would be maintained. To achieve this, there would be stipulations imposed on new oil and gas leases; Controlled Surface Use Stipulations 9 and 10, Timing Limitations 12 and 13, and Lease Notice 1. The potential would exist for defined road densities with travel management planning and potential road closures*. Since mineral leases have already been issued throughout most of the herd area, BLM would attempt to maintain the preferred habitat through conditions of approval, specified with approvals of applications to drill.

Alternative E (Mid-Sized Herd with WSA Excluded): *The initial wild horse AML would range between 100 head and 207 horses. The AML could be adjusted at a later date based on monitoring of range conditions.* This management range would be based on a four year gather schedule. Every fourth year, the population would increase to approximately 207 horses. BLM would then reduce the population to approximately 100 horses with a gather using the standard gather techniques of helicopter-drive-trapping and helicopter herding-roping (see Appendix C). Periodic introduction of wild horses into the herd from other HMAs would be used as a means to increase herd genetic variability (see Appendix E). *Unique to this alternative is that horses would not be managed within the Oil Springs Mountain Wilderness Study Area (WSA).* Wild horses would be fenced out of the WSA with 9.4 miles of fence (see Figure 2-1 for the proposed location of this fence). BLM would build and maintain the WSA fence. *BLM would also encourage horse movement into the northern part of the herd area by establishing a corridor approach. BLM would identify basic requirements to maintain preferred horse habitat. BLM would monitor the need to develop additional water sources and increased management of these sources.* The permittee would remain responsible for all other range improvements. *BLM would allocate an average of*

2232 AUMs to wild horses, of the estimated 6947 AUMs available. The remainder of the available forage (4715 AUMs) would be allocated to livestock. Livestock allocations would be reduced within the Twin Buttes Allotment to 4,510 AUMs, and increased in the Bull Draw Allotment to 205 AUMs. *There would be additional stipulations on new oil and gas leases to maintain preferred horse habitat: CSU-9, CSU-10, TL-12, TL-13 and LN-1. In addition CSU-11would be implemented to build the migration corridor. Creation of this corridor would also require reductions in road densities through travel management planning and potential road closures.* Cost of the fence, the removal of the summer range associated with Oil Spring Mountain and the current level of human development would prevent development of the corridor within the time frames of this planning document. This alternative was not considered feasible.

Alternative F (Mid-Sized Herd in Texas Mountain Preferred Habitat with Fences): *The initial AML would range between 100 horses, and 207 horses. The AML could be adjusted at a later date based on monitoring of range conditions.* This management range would be based on a four year gather schedule. Every fourth year, the population is expected to increase to approximately 207 horses. BLM would then reduce the population to approximately 100 horses with a gather using the standard gather techniques of helicopter-drive-trapping and helicopter herding-roping (see Appendix C). Periodic introduction of wild horses into the herd from other HMAs would be used as a means to increase herd genetic variability (see Appendix E). *In this alternative, wild horses would be managed only in the southern portion of the herd area.* BLM would build and maintain a fence along the southern boundary of the herd area, through the WSA (18.2 miles). BLM would also establish a northern boundary by building and maintaining another fence (14 miles). Figure 2-1 shows where these fences would be. *BLM would allocate an average of 2,232 AUMs to wild horses, of the estimated 3,279 available in this area. BLM would maintain water sources within the defined horse habitat area. Only trailing and incidental livestock use would be allowed in this horse habitat area. Total forage allocated to livestock within the herd area would be reduced to 4,715 AUMs.* Livestock allocations would be reduced within the Twin Buttes Allotment to 4,300 AUMs, and increased in the Bull Draw Allotment to 415 AUMs. *Basic requirements that make the Texas Mountain area the preferred horse habitat would be maintained. To achieve this, there would be additional stipulations on new oil and gas leases within the horse habitat area: CSU-9, CSU-10, TL-12, TL-13, and LN1. These stipulations include defined road densities that would also be implemented through travel management planning.* Horses would periodically be introduced into the herd to strengthen genetic variability. Cost of the fences, and the current level of human development which would limit the usability of key and preferred wild horse habitat, prevents this alternative from being implemented. This alternative was not considered feasible.

Alternative G (Maximum Sized Herd in Fenced Herd Area): *The initial AML for wild horses would range between 310 and 643 horses. The AML could be adjusted at a later date based on monitoring of range conditions.* This management range would be based on a four year gather schedule. Every fourth year, the population would consist of approximately 643 horses. BLM would then reduce the population to approximately 310 horses using the standard gather techniques of helicopter-drive-trapping and helicopter herding-roping (see Appendix C). Introduction of wild horses into the herd from other HMAs would be used initially as a means to increase herd genetic variability (see Appendix E). The entire boundary of the herd area would be fenced. *An average of 6914 AUMs would be allocated to wild horses. No forage would be allocated to livestock.* BLM would build and maintain 32.5 miles of new fence to completely enclose the herd area. This would include 18.2 miles on Oil Springs Mountain, through the WSA. BLM would also be responsible for maintaining approximately 61 miles of existing boundary fence, and all water sources within the herd area. Figure 2-1 shows all of these fences. *BLM would identify preferred horse habitat. To maintain this habitat, stipulations would be placed on new oil and gas leases including: CSU-9, CSU-10, and LN-1. These stipulations include defined road densities that would also be implemented through travel management planning.* Horses would initially be introduced into the herd to increase and maintain genetic variability (see Appendix E). Cost of the fences, negative impacts to the Oil Spring Mountain Wilderness Study Area and the current level of human development which would limit the usability of key and

preferred wild horse habitat , prevents this alternative from being implemented. This alternative was not considered feasible.

Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated From Detailed Analysis.

Alternative D (Mid-Sized Herd in Unfenced Herd Area): The wild horse AML would range between 100 horses and 207 horses. Gathers would be completed every four years, or in keeping with current program directives. An average of 2,232 AUMs of the estimated 6,914 available would be allocated to wild horses. BLM would allocate the remainder of forage to livestock. BLM would build no new fences. The grazing permittee would retain maintenance responsibility for range improvements. Horses would not be introduced into the herd to increase genetic variability. Fertility control would not be used to control herd recruitment. All other resources would be managed in accordance with the existing situation. There would be no new stipulations for Oil and Gas development. Under this alternative there is a high probability that wild horses would continue to move outside of the herd area, especially to the unfenced southwest. It would not be practical for BLM to attempt to continuously remove horses from outside the herd area and from private lands; therefore this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Alternative H (Maximum Sized Herd in Unfenced Herd Area): The wild horse AML would be between 300 minimum and 622 horses. Gathers would be conducted every four years. An average of 6,914 AUMs would be allocated to wild horses. There would be no fences. BLM would maintain existing fences and waters within and along the boundary of the herd area. BLM would not use fertility control, or introduce horses for increased genetic variability. There would be no new stipulations on Oil and Gas. The AML for this alternative would definitely exacerbate the problem with migration of wild horses to the southwest, out of the herd area and onto private land. It would be impractical and fiscally impossible for BLM to continuously gather the large number of horses that would move outside the herd area under this alternative. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.